

A Comparison of the Use of Binary Decision Trees and Neural Networks in Top Quark Detection

David Bowser-Chao[†]
Debra L. Dzialo[‡]

Center for Particle Physics
University of Texas at Austin
Austin TX 78712

ABSTRACT

The use of neural networks for signal vs. background discrimination in high-energy physics experiment has been investigated and has compared favorably with the efficiency of traditional kinematic cuts. Recent work in top quark identification produced a neural network that, for a given top quark mass, yielded a higher signal to background ratio in Monte Carlo simulation than a corresponding set of conventional cuts. In this article we discuss another pattern-recognition algorithm, the binary decision tree. We have applied a binary decision tree to top quark identification at the Tevatron and found it to be comparable in performance to the neural network. Furthermore, reservations about the “black box” nature of neural network discriminators do not apply to binary decision trees; a binary decision tree may be reduced to a set of kinematic cuts subject to conventional error analysis.

[†] email address (Internet): davechao@bongo.cc.utexas.edu

[‡] email address (Internet): phbd064@utxvms.cc.utexas.edu

1. Introduction

Neural networks have been proposed as an adjunct to or even replacement for cuts traditionally employed to separate signal from background in high-energy experiments.¹ Certainly the development of a powerful, general training algorithm for non-recursive neural networks² has established the forward-feed, back-propagation neural network as an important tool for pattern recognition, both in artificial intelligence and industrial applications. * A neural network can be trained to distinguish “signal” events from “background” events in a high-energy collider, differentiating between the two on the basis of kinematical variables such as angular separation, missing transverse energy $\cancel{E}_T$, etc. One of us (D.L.D) has investigated the use of a neural network trigger at the Tevatron for separating the top quark signal of one lepton plus jets from the strong W -boson plus multi-jet background.³ Among the results of this work was a neural network that for a given top quark mass obtained a higher signal to background ratio than a corresponding set of conventional cuts in Monte Carlo simulation.⁴

There exist reservations, however, about the use of neural network triggers in colliders. The architecture of the neural network responsible for its success in a wide range of pattern-recognition problems precludes straightforward error analysis, in contrast to the situation with simple kinematic cuts. Thus we have considered another pattern-recognition algorithm, the binary decision tree, and compared its performance with that of the neural network in the top quark detection problem of Ref. 3. In this particular case, the binary decision tree does about as well as the neural network solely on the basis of the respective increases in signal to background. The binary decision tree, however, may be reduced to a set of conventional kinematic cuts, and is subject therefore to the usual error propagation techniques.

Section 2 outlines the algorithm behind the binary decision tree, which is essentially an automated (and optimized) search for the series of kinematic cuts that will best isolate high signal percentage regions in phase space. A review of neural networks follows, both as background for the subsequent discussion comparing the two methods and to elucidate

* See the IEEE proceedings on neural networks of any year, for example.

difficulties encountered in the error analysis of a neural network trigger. Finally, we examine the differences between the neural network and binary decision tree and present the results of application of the binary decision tree to top quark identification.

2. Binary Decision Trees

In its simplest form, a signal trigger attempts to correctly classify events as signal or background by means of a linear inequality:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N a_i x_i > b, \quad (2.1)$$

where the x_i are the kinematical variables measured for each event that serve as input to the trigger. Given the x_i measured for an event, the trigger accepts the event if, say, the condition of Eq. (2.1) is satisfied, and rejects it otherwise. Of course, a single cut rarely suffices to reduce a strongly predominant background, so that triggers usually comprise several individual cuts administered jointly. A straightforward and common approach to obtaining cuts is to restrict the form of Eq. (2.1) by setting all the a_i except one, a_{i_0} , to zero, so that b represents either the minimum or maximum value of x_{i_0} allowed for an event to be accepted by the trigger. By plotting the distributions in x_{i_0} for signal and background, b can be chosen to maximize the expected signal to background ratio of accepted events. Such cuts may be formulated for each of the coordinates x_i and combined to form a set of N simultaneous conditions for event acceptance. Though one might suspect cuts of this form to lack the power of the generalized inequality expressed by Eq. (2.1), obtaining such an improved cut is rarely possible since difficulties associated with the construction (and interpretation) of higher dimension plots and histograms usually limit the use of more than one non-zero a_i to instances in which all non-zero a_i are equal (e.g., a cut on *total* lepton transverse momenta p_T).

The aim of the binary decision tree presented here is to enable and optimize the choice of such generalized cuts and thus to formulate event discriminators of higher efficiency than those derived through standard methods. The basic algorithm is easily understood by considering Eq. (2.1) geometrically; the inequality defines an N -dimensional hyperplane that divides the phase space in two. Points on one side of the plane are classified as signal and points on the other as background. If the a_i are normalized, they define the

normal to the hyperplane, with b signifying the normal distance between the plane and origin. The centroids of the signal and background distributions, x_s and x_b , are points in this N -dimensional space that if not coincident define the binary decision tree's initial generalized cut as the hyperplane midway between x_s and x_b , perpendicular to their unit separation vector $\mathbf{d}$. Thus the a_i are identified with the components of $\mathbf{d}$ and b is (modulo a possible sign) equal to half the distance between the two points. The cut partitions phase space into two pieces, one of which is guaranteed to have at least as high a signal to background ratio as the parent (pre-cut) distribution. If this piece is deemed to have a sufficiently high expected signal to background ratio or if further cuts would overly reduce the signal acceptance rate, division halts. Otherwise, it is successively divided by generalized cuts as described above. The end result is a series of simultaneous cuts that delimit a subregion of accepted events. Furthermore, at each division the piece with the lower signal to background ratio need not be discarded; cuts may be applied to it as well, with the aim of gaining additional pockets of signal. The hierarchy of cuts and the partition of phase space into “signal” and “background” regions make up the definition of the binary decision tree. ‡ The recursive selection of hyperplanes (i.e., determination of a set of a_i and b) is denoted as the “training” of the binary decision tree, which is binary because at each step intermediate regions (nodes) are divided into two branches. The terminal regions are the “leaves” of the binary decision tree, and are classified as signal or background according to the percentage of signal present. The hyperplanes thus defined may be used exactly as the simpler conventional cuts to implement an equivalent trigger.

In practice, the signal and background distribution functions of x_i are represented efficiently (but with limited accuracy) by sets of signal and background events, respectively Ω_S and Ω_B , generated by Monte Carlo simulation. Note that while quantities such as the percentage of signal events on one side of a hyperplane are estimated by a count of events in Ω_S and Ω_B that fall on that side, even if one had an overall signal to background ratio of 10^{-6} we would *not* require 10^6 times more background than signal events for training.

‡ The binary decision tree presented here is based on both the work of P. Burchard with B. Merriman (Ref. 5) and that of R.P. Brent. With the exception of the scaling factor K , the algorithm for optimizing hyperplanes is defined in Ref. 6

Given an equal number of signal and background events, we could simply scale any count of background events by the factor of 10^6 .

There are limitations, however, that arise from working with finite-size “training” sets; a hyperplane as constructed above may be considered unsatisfactory for a number of reasons, all related to expected statistical error present in the training distributions. The hyperplane, for example, might leave one side with an apparently high signal percentage but so few signal events as to render such a cut unreliable. For this reason it is prudent to consider other candidate hyperplanes, such as the simplified hyperplanes corresponding to traditional cuts that lie parallel to all but one axis. A cost function Q , used to evaluate the desirability and/or reliability of a cut, is required to decide among the candidate hyperplanes. We employed two different cost functions, one of which, drawn from Ref. 6, measures the “entropy” produced by a candidate hyperplane and is given by:

$$Q(S_l, B_l, S_r, B_r) = -\log \left(\frac{S_l! B_l! S_r! B_r!}{(S_l + B_l)! (S_r + B_r)!} \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where S_l and B_r are, respectively, the (possibly scaled) number of signal events on the side of the hyperplane arbitrarily designated as “left,” and the (possibly scaled) number of background events on the other side.

Q is an implicit function of the hyperplane coordinates $\{a_i, b\}$ through $\{S_l, B_l, S_r, B_r\}$. For an ideal hyperplane in which $S_r = B_l = 0$, Q takes on its minimum value of zero. By selecting the hyperplane in a given set of candidate hyperplanes with the smallest value of Q , the current subregion of phase space is divided into two branches, each with a signal fraction as far away from 0.5 as possible. Note that maximizing the difference between the signal fractions and 0.5 does not necessarily correspond to maximizing the signal fractions themselves. To bias the binary decision tree more towards the latter strategy, we alternatively used the following cost function:

$$Q(S_l, B_l, S_r, B_r) = 2 - \left(\frac{S_l}{S_l + B_l} \right)^n - \left(\frac{S_r}{S_r + B_r} \right)^n. \quad (2.3)$$

The binary decision trees discussed in Section 4 have n set equal to 2, which produces a bias toward hyperplanes which create one branch with a higher signal to background ratio.

Both cost functions require additional constraints to prevent creation of leaves that, although apparently high in signal percentage, have so few events as to render them statistically meaningless. We implement these constraints by substituting the true value of

Q for unacceptable hyperplanes with a large positive constant, which thus leads to their rejection.

Aside from its use in selecting between candidate hyperplanes, the cost function Q makes possible the *optimization* of a candidate hyperplane. Rotating and translating the hyperplane, by modifying the a_i and b respectively, shifts events from one side of the hyperplane to the other, increasing or decreasing S_l , B_r , etc., and thus $Q = Q(S_l, B_l, S_r, B_r)$ as well. Continuous or discrete optimization may be carried out to minimize Q by appropriately adjusting a_i and b . If the training sets are sufficiently large to permit interpolation of sorts, continuous optimization is preferable to a discrete algorithm. Following the prescription of Ref. 6, Q can be transformed into an analytic function of the hyperplane coordinates $\{a_i, b\}$ by means of the following approximations of S_l and B_r :

$$\begin{aligned}
 S_l &= S_l(a_i, b) \\
 &= \sum_{x_i \in \Omega_S} \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \tanh \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i x_i - b \right) \right) \right] \\
 B_r &= S_r(a_i, b) \\
 &= \sum_{x_i \in \Omega_B} \frac{1}{2} \left[1 - \tanh \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{i=1}^N a_i x_i - b \right) \right) \right], \tag{2.4}
 \end{aligned}$$

with analogous substitutions made for S_r and B_l . To simulate the pre-cut signal to background ratio for training purposes, we furthermore modified Eq. (2.4) by $B_l \rightarrow KB_l$, $B_r \rightarrow KB_r$, where the scaling factor K is

$$K = \left(\frac{S}{B} \right)_{\text{train}} \left(\frac{S}{B} \right)_{\text{actual}}^{-1}. \tag{2.5}$$

The first ratio is simply that of the number of signal events used in training to that of background events, and the second is the theoretically or experimentally known value of the pre-cut signal to background ratio. As the temperature parameter $T \rightarrow 0$, the first line of Eq. (2.4) estimates the number of events in the signal set Ω_S that fall on the side arbitrarily designated as the “left”, while the second line with an oppositely signed tanh term (and multiplied by the factor K) gives an approximate *scaled* count of background events on the right side. With these differentiable approximations of S_l , B_l , S_r , and B_r , Q itself becomes a differentiable function of a_i and b . To minimize Q and simultaneously

optimize the hyperplane, we employed the Polak-Ribiere algorithm for conjugate gradient minimization.⁷ As with the exact form of Q , to take into account the limited size and accuracy of the training sets, we substituted the value of Q computed from Eqs. (2.2) or (2.3) with a large positive constant if, for example, a candidate hyperplane would leave either created branch with less than a user-defined minimum of events.

Finally, we remark that by restricting hyperplanes to lie along coordinate axes as in simplified cuts (by requiring all a_i but one, a_{i_0} , to be equal to zero) and by replacing the $(N + 1)$ -dimensional optimization of $\{a_i, b\}$ with a line optimization of b alone, the resulting algorithm is that of the k - d tree.⁸ This type of decision tree has in fact already obtained successful results in high-energy physics, having been employed in Mark II and Mark III to discriminate between electrons and pions.⁹ The k - d tree demands less cpu time for training than the binary decision tree discussed in Section 4 at the cost of a generally larger number of hyperplanes required for comparable performance.

3. Neural Networks

This Section provides only the detail necessary to give some perspective on the differences between neural networks, binary decision trees, and more conventional methods of separating signal from background. A more complete introduction to neural networks may be found in Ref. 3 and the references therein. Consideration here is limited to the neural network architecture/training method most commonly used in pattern recognition with supervised training, the forward-feed back-propagation neural network.

The neural network is parameterized by a set of weights $\omega_{ji}^{(L)}$ that connect the nodes y_j of layer L with the nodes y_i of the preceeding layer $L - 1$. Each training event is assigned a numerical classification according to background=0, signal= 1. Training the neural network consists of a gradient descent optimization of the weights to minimize the squared difference of the classification of each event and the neural network function f evaluated at the event's coordinates x_i . The sum of this "quadratic error" over the training sets Ω_S and Ω_B is the network equivalent of the cost function Q used by the binary decision tree. The neural network function f for an architecture of M layers and $N^{(L)}$ nodes in layer L

is given as

$$f(x_i) = y^{(M)} \left(y^{(M-1)} \right), \quad (3.1)$$

with the functions $y^{(L)}$ defined recursively,

$$y_j^{(L)} \left(y^{(L-1)} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + \tanh \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^{N^{(L-1)}} \omega_{ji}^{(L)} y_i^{L-1} \right) \right], \quad (3.2)$$

and for

$$\begin{aligned} y_i^{(1)} &= x_i, \\ L &= 1, \dots, M, \\ N^{(M)} &= 1, \\ N^{(1)} &= N. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the neural network function f is a differentiable function of the weights.

In order to train a neural network, the sets Ω_S and Ω_B must have a relative size approximately equal to the theoretical signal to background ratio (in contrast with the case of binary decision tree training if the scaling parameter K is used), because in practice, stochastic gradient descent is substituted for classical gradient descent. In training with stochastic gradient descent, a single event is chosen at random from Ω_S or Ω_B , f and its derivatives with respect to the weights are calculated, and the weights $\omega_{ji}^{(L)}$ are immediately rotated by a small amount toward the “downhill” direction of the quadratic error function. This process is repeated for all training events in random order and for many cycles. In this way, the weights gradually and smoothly move toward an optimal classification of the entire training with much more modest computational demands than if classical gradient descent were employed. In the latter case, however, because the order of presentation of events does not matter (since weights are updated only after presentation of the entire set), one can “scale” Ω_B as necessary by multiplying each background event’s contribution to the quadratic error function by the factor K defined in Eq. (2.5). Training however, requires much more computational time than the classical gradient algorithm.

After successful training, the neural network function f should take on values greater than $\frac{1}{2}$ for signal events and less than $\frac{1}{2}$ for background. In deriving a trigger from such a neural network, one has the freedom to specify the threshold value $f(x_i) = \theta$ for an event

to be classified as signal. As $\theta \rightarrow 1$, the accepted events should increase in signal purity and decrease in signal efficiency.

4. Results

In this section we present our results for the binary decision tree performance in comparison with that of the neural network of Ref. 3 in obtaining a ratio of signal to background events in the particular application of top quark identification via the one-lepton channel at the Tevatron.

The training and testing event sets Ω_S and Ω_B are the same as those used in Ref. 3 for which top quark production and the relevant background are simulated by the Monte Carlo event generator PYTHIA¹⁰ at $p\bar{p}$ center of mass energy 1.8 TeV. We consider here a top quark mass of both 100 and 140 GeV. The W -boson plus multijet background is also generated by PYTHIA from $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Wg$ and $qg \rightarrow Wq$ subprocesses. We reproduce the acceptance cuts applied to each event so generated; further details of the simulation of training and testing sets are found in Ref. 3: a) one and only electron- or muon-type charged lepton of $p_T > 20$ GeV and pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 3.0$, b) 3 or more hadronic jets, each of energy 15 GeV and pseudorapidity $|\eta| < 2.5$, for jet cone size defined to be $\Delta r = 0.7$, c) total missing energy $\cancel{E}_T > 20$ GeV, and d) lepton isolation such that the sum of hadronic energy within a cone of size $\Delta r = 0.4$ centered about the lepton momentum is less than 3 GeV.

A number of parameters were used in the construction of the binary decision trees to specify criteria for the classification and division of nodes. Division was halted at a node if: a) it contained less than MIN_{S+B} signal plus (scaled) background events (1–50)*, b) it contained less than THRESHOLD_{S+B} total events (10–10000) with a background event fraction higher than $\text{MAX}_{B/(S+B)}$ (0.90–0.99), c) it possessed a sufficiently high signal event fraction $\text{MIN}_{S/(S+B)}$ (0.50–0.93), or d) all attempts at division would result in either the left or right branch being less than $\text{MIN}_{L/(L+R)}$ (0.0001) of the parent node. A node thus terminated would be classified as a signal leaf if it contained at least MIN_S (10–300)

* For illustrative purposes, the value/range of each parameter used in training the binary decision trees for the $m_t=140$ GeV signal are indicated in parentheses.

signal events, and as a background leaf otherwise. The optimization process was controlled by the choice of the temperature T (0.0001–10) and the minimum fractional reduction (0.05) required for continued iterations of the conjugate gradient descent algorithm.

A group of binary decision trees was generated for each top quark mass by varying the above parameters. A set of triggers covering a range of signal to background ratios and signal efficiencies was thus obtained. Each binary decision tree was trained and tested on the same sets Ω_S and Ω_B used in Ref. 3. For the $m_t=100$ GeV, Ω_S consisted of 4500 points and Ω_B contained 5500, while for $m_t=140$ GeV, Ω_S had 1500 points and Ω_B had 8500. Note that the relative sizes of Ω_S and Ω_B approximated the respective signal to background ratios of 0.77 and 0.19 for the 100 and 140 GeV top quark mass, respectively. All binary decision trees were subsequently tested on sets of 2500 signal and 2500 background points.

Figure 1 shows the best results obtained for the binary decision trees to recognize the top quark signal for $m_t=140$ GeV. The efficiencies plotted are simply the percentage of signal accepted by each trigger. Plotted alongside these data are a single point representing the “severe” conventional cuts described in Ref. 3 and the results obtained from the neural network trained with the same Ω_S and Ω_B . The latter set of points was produced by setting the neural network-derived trigger threshold θ to $\{0, 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1\}$. The binary decision tree triggers more or less match their neural network counterpart, though we were unable to reproduce points with extremely high efficiency (but correspondingly low signal to background ratios). A similar result is apparent from Figure 2, for $m_t=100$ GeV, which can be attributed to the fact that despite the similarity of Eqs. (2.4) and (3.2), a neural network of at least 4 layers partitions space in a very different fashion from the binary decision tree (a neural network with only $M = 3$ layers —the minimum possible — is functionally identical to a binary decision tree with only two leaves.) Regions identified by the neural network as signal are precisely those signal and background events for which $f(x_i) \geq \theta$. Examination of Eq. (3.2) reveals that if $M \geq 4$, the boundaries of these regions are complex curved surfaces arising from inverting two or more recursive tanh functions. Regions classified as signal by a binary decision tree, on the other hand, have hyperplanar boundaries. Thus the neural network might fare better for lower-efficiency cuts because the “ideal” partition in these cases would enclose as many signal events as possible within one contiguous region using a smooth (non-planar) boundary. In the region where the

trigger signal to background ratio is appreciably enhanced over that of the parent pre-cut distribution, the binary decision tree essentially matches the performance of the neural network, and both gain substantial improvement over the “severe” set of conventional cuts (see Figures 1 and 2). For example, in one of the binary decision trees trained on the $m_t=140$ GeV data, the initial hyperplane alone managed to partition off a signal region with the same efficiency (50%) as the conventional cuts but with a signal to background ratio of 1 instead of 0.65.

Although in this particular application the neural network and binary decision tree obtained remarkably similar quantitative results, a few interesting qualitative differences were observed as well. As noted above, a neural network of more than 3 layers divides up space in a quite complicated way. Even supplied with the weights that define the neural network, it is in general impossible to derive the boundaries of “signal” regions explicitly, which makes error analysis of the experimental results from a neural network-derived trigger quite difficult. By nature of its design, a binary decision tree-derived trigger is comparatively transparent in its operation, and fully equivalent to conventional simplified cuts for error analysis purposes. Furthermore, by examining the hyperplane normals of the trained binary decision tree one may glean information regarding the relative importance of the kinematic variables x_i for discrimination between signal and background in each subregion of phase space.

The respective training phases of the neural network and the binary decision tree differ greatly in the computational resources required. Training of the binary decision trees required anywhere from 5% down to 0.2% of the cpu time used to train the neural networks of Ref. 3, thus bearing out the observation³ that training time for a neural network should increase much more rapidly with the addition of layers than that of a comparable binary decision tree.

The results for the neural network are more stable than those for the binary decision tree in the sense that variations in the parameters that serve to define the neural network, such as the temperature and the number of hidden layers (Ref. 3), do not appreciably change them. The binary decision tree, on the other hand, produced a wide range of results as parameters such as the minimum signal percentage, $\text{MIN}_{S/(S+B)}$, were varied. In this application, in fact, the neural network’s performance was used as a benchmark,

toward which the binary decision trees were trained. The parameter $\text{MIN}_{S/(S+B)}$ would initially be set equal to a given signal percentage attained by the neural network, and other parameters would be varied in an attempt to match or surpass the neural network's efficiency.

Finally, we note here that though not a limitation for this particular application, an extremely small signal to background ratio would mean that to train a neural network, one would require a potentially huge Monte Carlo-generated background training set Ω_B , due to the use of stochastic gradient minimization. The binary decision tree, in contrast, can scale the background set as necessary for any signal to background ratio through K , so that Ω_S and Ω_B need only be large enough to represent the theoretical distributions faithfully and in sufficient detail.

The authors are grateful for much helpful discussion and participation by D.A. Dicus and G.F. Giudice. We would like to acknowledge the aid of B. Merriman and P. Burchard, whose work in binary decision trees prompted our own investigations, and R.P. Brent, whose algorithm is used for hyperplane optimization. Finally, one of us (D.B-C) expresses his appreciation for several insightful comments on differences between binary decision trees and neural networks made by E.I. Levine.

References

1. B. Denby, M. Campbell, F. Bedeschi, N. Chriss, C. Bowers, and F. Nesti, FERMILAB-Conf-90/20.
2. D.E. Rumelhart, G.E. Hinton, and R.J. Williams, "Learning Internal Representations by Error Propagation," in D.E. Rumelhart and J.L. McClelland (Eds.), *Parallel Distributed Processing: Explorations in the Microstructure of Cognition (Vol.1)*, MIT Press, 1986.
3. H. Baer, D.L. Dzialo, and G.F. Giudice, accepted for publication in Phys. Rev. D.
4. H. Baer, V. Barger, and R.J.N. Phillips, Phys. Rev. D39, 3310 (1989).
5. P. Burchard and B. Merriman, private communication.
6. R.P. Brent, "Fast Training Algorithms for Multi-layer Neural Nets", Australian National Laboratory, submitted to Neural Networks.
7. W.H. Press, B.P. Flannery, S.A. Teukolsky, and W.T. Vetterling, *Numerical Recipes in C*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1988.
8. J.L. Bentley, Comm. ACM 23, 214 (1980). S.M. Omohundro, Complex Systems 1, 273 (1987).
9. J. Dorfan, private communication.
10. H.-U. Bengtsson and T. Sjöstrand, PYTHIA 5.5 program and manual; see H.-U. Bengtsson and T. Sjöstrand, Computer Phys. Comm. 46, 43 (1987).

5. Figure Captions

Figure 1: Results of training binary decision trees to recognize the top quark signal assuming $m_t=140$ GeV; data for the corresponding neural network with the threshold θ set (going from right to left on the graph) to $\{0, 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1\}$ is included, as is a single point representing the “severe” conventional cuts of Ref. 3. The vertical axis gives the expected signal to background ratio of the derived triggers while the horizontal axis displays the signal efficiency (the percentage of signal accepted by each trigger).

Figure 2: Results for the binary decision trees, neural network, and set of conventional cuts for a top quark mass of $m_t=100$ GeV. Note that the leftmost data point for the neural network was omitted because of insufficient statistics.